DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 365 PS 007 875

AUTHOR Healy, Margaret I.
TITLE Mundelein-HICA Early Childhood Education Project. End-of-Project Summary.
INSTITUTION Mundelein Coll., Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Achievement; Child Development; *Data Analysis; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Disadvantagement; *Experimental Programs; Ghettos; *Home Programs; Intelligence Quotient; Intervention; Measurement Techniques; Minority Groups; Parent Education; Test Results

ABSTRACT

This summary report examines the findings of a home-based early childhood education enrichment program designed to make it possible for educationally disadvantaged children to cope effectively with the demands of American schools and society. Background information on the development and implementation of the program and a discussion of the statistical data are included. The two hypotheses tested concerned: (1) the ability of children in the project to cope with the school's and society demands on entering first grade (as measured by Stanford-Binet IQ scores and achievement test scores), and (2) their ability to adjust to and remain in school (as measured by attendance records, school achievement tests, and school grades). Results of these first comparisons of the various experimental groups of children born in 1967 and 1968 indicate support for both hypotheses. Data tables and appendixes are included. (ED)

ED107365

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POL Y

Mundelein-HICA Early Childhood Education Project

Grant Number: 3 RO1 MH 20519-0351

National Institute of Mental Health

END-OF-PROJECT SUMMARY

PS 007875

Margaret I. Healy, Ph. D.

331-44-2018

00002

THE MUNDELEIN-HICA HOME-BASED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

SUMMARY

December 1974

Through the Mundelein-HICA Home-Based Early Childhood Education Program the investigator sought to test the hypothesis that "An enriched early childhood education program beginning with the child at the age of two and supported by an educational program to improve the educational opportunities in the home can make it possible for educationally disadvantaged children to cope effectively with the demands of American schools and American society, thereby reducing the incidence of maladjustment, unemployment and of school drop-outs."

The problem that gave rise to the program was the discouraging school records of children from Chicago's Black ghetto neighborhoods that evidenced the inability of many children to cope with the school's and society's demands when entering first grade. Apparently a number of causes contributed to the problem, but some were of chief concern to this investigator and also to the residents of the community involved. Among these were the following: 1) there was a lack of year round nursery schools that were educational centers for child and parent; 2) many parents were unable to motivate and help children learn; 3) many parents were unable to provide the home environment which would stimulate learning and contribute to healthy physical, mental and emotional growth; 4) there was a lack of training programs

00603

for parents and for nursery school aides so that frequently nursery schools where they did exist were babysitting and custodial centers; 5) there was a high incidence of unemployment among the families' heads and of school drop-outs among their children; and finally, 6) a number of the schools were inadequate and their programs were irrelevant to the needs of the children and the families they served -- or should have served.

In 1967 Mundelein College initiated an exploratory program in a small neighborhood in the Lawndale area of Chicago incorporated under the name HICA and by 1969 was developing with members of the Black community and with the assistance of funds from Chicago's Model Cities Office a Child-Parent Center. The intent was to provide an early intervention program for young children beginning at age two or three from the most disadvantaged homes. Aware that change must take place in the total environment, the program was planned not only for the children in the Child Center, but for their parents, and parallel planning was made for community and school change. Active and persistent recruiting for the Child Center was carried out by members of the neighborhood who were hired and trained for the work, but while their efforts became successful in bringing very needy children into the Center Program, involvement of parents, where the need was greatest, was almost impossible to achieve.

00001

In 1970 after observing Dr. Susan Gray's Home Education Program in Nashville, Tennessee, the decision was made to develop a similar program in HICA. It seemed clear that, if society really believes that parents are the prime educators of their children, then the home, not a child-center or school, should be the target of early intervention efforts, particularly when a family is obviously in need of such assistance. Going to the HOME and working with parent and child in the home gives strong and implicit recognition of the importance of the parent and the home, in contrast to the Center or School-based parent-education programs. Further, involving parents in a formal educational program in the home almost insures their sustained support of their child's efforts to learn, once they develop an understanding and appreciation of their children's potential and of their own ability to provide for their children's growth and development.

In three years, 73 families were reached through the Mundelein-HICA Home-Based Early Childhood Education Program. While the parent and one child, age two or three, was the focus of the educational program in each family, approximately 200 pre-school children and at least 100 adults were involved through the efforts of four neighborhood women who had been intensively trained as early childhood educators and who had special expertise in meeting the needs of the Black families.

To test the hypothesis of this research it is necessary to break it down into measurable components, two of which can now be tested.

1) Children involved in the Mundelein-HICA Home Education Program are

99605

able to cope with the "school's and society's demands when entering first grade."

2) Children involved in the Mundelein-HICA Home Education program will be able to adjust to and will remain in school.

Instruments for testing the first hypothesis were the Stanford-Binet IQ scores and achievement test scores. The second hypothesis was tested by using data from attendance records, by school achievement tests and school grades. Data has been gathered to provide for follow-up studies to test the main hypothesis more fully in the future.

The results of our first measurements indicate that both hypotheses can be accepted; that is, children involved in the Mundelein-HICA Home Education Program were able to cope with "the school's and society's demands" when they entered first grade. This conclusion is based on the fact that on the Stanford-Binet IQ test the group scored in the normal range, and at the end of first grade, in spite of their original home disadvantage, they were performing as well as their peers in the control group on achievement tests. (See Data Report, Tables 1, 8, and 9.)

The acceptance of the second hypothesis was based on unexpectedly significant data. Children involved in home education or in the child center program, one, or the other, or both of the treatments, tended to stay in school, in contrast to their peers in the control group. The experimental Home Education group that entered kindergarten at the neighboring school, tested Fall 1973 and again Spring 1974, dropped in number by 11%.

00006

The control sample dropped by 40%. (See Data Report, Table 2.)

As indicated in the DATA REPORT, NOVEMBER 1974 many questions are raised by our data and efforts will be made to answer at least some of them, particularly why only eight of an expected thirty-four children from our Home Education Program entered the local public school in the Fall 1974. It is to be regretted that the Project Period was limited to three years because much more data should be collected and our samples should be enlarged to provide firm conclusions.

The real impact of the HOME Education Program can be measured only by a longitudinal and in-depth study of at least 50 of the participating families. Perhaps some of the most encouraging data is shown in Table 1 of the DATA REPORT, which indicated the gradual growth of the kindergarten children whose parents were at the same time participating in Home Education with younger children. When it is kept in mind that most of these families are the "hard core" poor, chiefly welfare families who have seen their economic status as a way of life, whose language skills are very limited, and whose value-system is based on primitive survival, normal IQ scores (even though low normal), and achievement scores comparable to a random sample of children in the same school are hopeful signs. These children were not in home education because their parents were initially motivated to encourage their children's mental development. They were involved because of the

00007

committed door-to-door recruiting of four dedicated women who lived in the same neighborhood, were sensitive to the fears and problems of these parents, but at the same time were aware of their strengths, and "sold" them on their own ability to learn about and to guide the development of their own children, -- "sold" them too on their children's strengths and potential.

00803

DATA REPORT ON THE MUNDELEIN-HICA EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

November 30, 1974

This supplement to the previous report of May, 1974 contains an analysis of descriptive data listed then, and a report on initial testing of a new group, children born in 1969. These are the groups to be discussed in this report:

B. D. 1967 -- This group of children with birthdates in 1967 (B. D. 1967) entered kindergarten September 1972 and has been tested Fall 1972, Spring 1973 and Spring 1974. The group is subdivided into two sections:

Preschool (Children in an early intervention Child Center Program) and

Control

B. D. 1968 -- This group of children with birthdates in 1968 (B. D. 1968) entered kindergarten September 1973 and has been tested Fall 1973 and Spring 1974. The group is subdivided into four sections:

Preschool (Children in an early intervention Child Center Program);

Home Education;

Preschool Plus Home Education; and

Control

B. D. 1969 -- This group of children with birthdates in 1969 (B. D. 1969) entered kindergarten September 1974 and was tested Fall 1974. The group is subdivided into four sections:

Preschool;

Home Education;

Preschool Plus Home Education;

Control.

Following is a listing of the tables to be presented and discussed in the text of this report.

Table 1: "Mean Stanford-Binet IQ's of Experimental and Control Groups, Fall 1972 through Fall 1974"

Table 2: "Attrition Rate by Experimental Condition for B. D. 1967 and B. D. 1968 Groups"

Table 3: "Significance of Differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's Between B. D. 1967 Groups at the Three Different Testings"

Table 4: "Significance of Differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's Between B. D. 1968 Groups at the Two Different Testings"

Table 5: "Significance of Differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's Between B. D. 1969 Groups at the Fall 1974 Testing"

Table 6: "Significance of Differences in Test-Retest Stanford-Binet IQ's for B. D. 1967 Groups"

Table 7: "Significance of Differences in Test-Retest Stanford-Binet IQ's for B. D. 1968 Groups, Fall 1973 vs. Spring 1974"

00010

Table 8: "Mean Achievement Test Scores of B. D. 1967 and 1968 Groups"

Table 9: "Mean Differences in Achievement Test Scores (a) Between B. D. 1967 Preschool and Control Groups (b) Between B. D. 1968 Experimental and Control Groups"

As the title indicates Table 1 lists the descriptive summary data for all three B. D. groups on Stanford-Binet performance. Note that for B. D. 1967 and B. D. 1968 groups, two different N's are reported for certain test dates. The first N and Mean IQ are with the sample available when that test was originally given. The second N and Mean IQ are computed with only the subjects who were then available for re-test so that the groups are consistent with regard to composition when comparisons are made.

Table 2 shows the attrition rate of subjects by B. D. and by experimental condition. The striking differences between experimental groups and controls in mobility is noted. Over the two school years that the 1967 group has been studied, the Preschool subjects have dropped from 11 to 9 (18% loss) whereas the Controls from that same year group have dropped from 19 to 8 (58% loss). The trend is being repeated with the 1968 B. D. group. Seventeen of the 19 original experimental subjects remained at the end of kindergarten (10 1/2% loss) whereas only 6 of the original 10 Control subjects were still enrolled at the end of kindergarten (40% loss). Those subjects who experienced some kind of intervention prior to entrance to the public school

00911

system are showing a stability lacking in those subjects who did not. (Intervention refers to the preschool and/or the home education experiences.) The causes or factors related to this difference between groups cannot be deduced from current data. Efforts are currently being made by a community worker, formerly a Home Educator, to follow up on the moves of those subjects who dropped out of the study.

00012

TABLE 1

Mean Stanford-Binet IQ's of Experimental and Control Groups, Fall, 1972 through Fall, 1974

GROUP	FALL 1972			SPRING 1973			FALL 1973			SPRING 1974			FALL 1974		
	N	Mn	S.D.	N	Mn	S.D.	N	Mn	S.D.	N	Mn	S.D.	N	Mn	S.D.
B.D. 1967															
1. Preschool															
a. Sample available Spring 1973	10	99.60		10	92.30		Not Tested				- - - -		Not Tested		
b. Sample available Spring 1974	9	99.40	6.02	9	91.11	7.82	Not Tested			9	100.56	9.43	Not Tested		
2. Control															
a. Sample available Spring 1973	15	95.00		15	95.30		Not Tested				- - - -		Not Tested		
b. Sample available Spring 1974	8	94.37	8.18	8	92.12	5.63	Not Tested			8	93.75	8.50	Not Tested		
B.D. 1968															
1. Preschool															
a. Original Sample							5	108.00			- - - - -		Not Tested		
b. Spring 1974 Sample							4	106.00	11.02	4	103.50	10.23	Not Tested		
2. Home Education															
a. Original Sample							9	86.60			- - - - -		Not Tested		
b. Spring 1974 Sample							8	87.63	13.00	8	91.75	12.11	Not Tested		
3. Preschool plus Home Education															
a. Original Sample							5	101.00			- - - -		Not Tested		
b. Spring 1974 Sample							5	100.40	4.40	5	104.40	6.25	Not Tested		
4. Control															
a. Original Sample							10	92.00			- - - -		Not Tested		
b. Spring 1974 Sample							6	92.00	22.12	6	92.83	17.52	Not Tested		
5. All 3 Experimental Groups										17	98.24	11.94	Not Tested		
B.D. 1969															
1. Preschool													5	97.00	5.40
2. Home Education													5	92.00	16.80
3. Preschool plus Home Education													3	98.00	15.58
4. Control													13	90.54	8.68
5. All 3 Experimental Groups													13	95.31	13.52

TABLE 2

Attrition Rate by Experimental Condition for B.D. 1967 and B.D. 1968 Groups

	Fall 1974 N	Spring 1973 N	Fall 1973 N	Spring 1974 N	Fall 1974 N	Total Loss	% Loss
B.D. 1967							
Preschool	11 *	10	Not Tested	9	Not Tested	2	18%
Control	19 *	15	Not Tested.	8	Not Tested	11	58%
B.D. 1968							
Preschool			5	4	Not Tested	1	20%
Home Education			9	8	Not Tested	1	11%
Preschool plus Home Education			5	5	Not Tested	0	0
All Experimental Groups			19	17	Not Tested	2	10 1/2%
Control			10	6	Not Tested	4	40%
B.D. 1969							
Preschool						5	N/A
Home Education						5	N/A
Preschool plus Home Education						3	N/A
All Experimental Groups						13	N/A
Control						13	N/A

* Original Fall Kindergarten Sample

17000-9

Table 3 indicates that at the first kindergarten testing and the final testing at the finish of first grade a raw score mean IQ difference existed in favor of the Preschool subjects over the Controls (B. D. 1967 group). This difference approached significance for the first testing (Mn Dif=4.60, df=23, t=1.46, $p < .10$). The middle testing, at the completion of kindergarten, showed a dip for the Preschool children; their mean IQ fell 3 points below that of the controls. This difference between the groups was not significant, however.

At this point, it is important to examine Table 6, which shows differences within the same group from one test date to the next for the 1967-born children. The Preschool children with early experiences in preschool showed a susceptibility, a kind of vulnerability, or a malleability, that the Controls did not. From start to finish of kindergarten, the Preschool-prepared children slipped significantly in IQ performance (Mn Dif 7.30 IQ points, df=9, t=2.47, $p < .05$, 2-tailed). Controls remained constant. From end of kindergarten to end of first grade, however, the Preschool-prepared children showed another significant change, this time upward (Mn dif 9.45 IQ points, df=8, t=4.33, $p < .01$, 2-tailed). Controls continued to remain constant. The result was that at the end of first grade children in the experimental group had regained the IQ level at which they tested when they entered kindergarten (Mn dif Fall 1972 to Spring 1974 = 1.12 IQ points, df=8, t=.41, not significant).

TABLE 3

Significance of Differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's
Between B.D. 1967 Groups
At the Three Different Testings

Test Date	Mn Difference	df	t	p
Fall 1972	4.60	23	1.46	< .10
Spring 1973	-3.00	23	.76	Not Significant
Spring 1974	6.81	15	1.46	Not Significant

91603

TABLE 4

Significance of Differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's
Between B.D. 1968 Groups
At the Two Different Testings

TEST DATE FALL 1973 Groups Compared	Mn Difference	df	t	p
Preschool vs Control	16.00	13	1.46	<.10, 1-tailed
Preschool vs Home Education	21.40	12	2.96	<.02, 2-tailed
Home Education vs Control	-5.40	17	.63	Not Significant
Home Education and Preschool vs Control	9.00	13	.86	Not Significant
SPRING 1974 Groups Compared				
Preschool vs Control	10.67	8	.98	Not Significant, 1-tailed
Preschool vs Home Education	11.75	10	1.38	Not Significant, 2-tailed
Preschool vs Home Education and Preschool	.90	7	.14	Not Significant, 1-tailed
Home Education vs Home Education and Preschool	12.65	11	1.99	<.05, 1-tailed
Home Education vs Control	-1.08	12	.13	Not Significant, 1-tailed
Home Education and Preschool vs Control	11.57	9	1.27	Not Significant, 1-tailed
All 3 Experimental Groups vs Control	5.41	21	.80	Not Significant, 1-tailed

TABLE 5

Significance of Differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's
Between B.D. 1969 Groups
At the Fall 1974 Testing

Groups Compared	Mn Difference	df	t	p
Preschool* vs Control	6.46	16	4.04	<.005, 1-tailed
Preschool vs Home Education	5.00	8	.60	Not Significant, 2-tailed
Preschool vs Home Education and Preschool	1.00	6	.11	Not Significant, 1-tailed
Home Education vs Home Education and Preschool	6.00	6	.43	Not Significant, 1-tailed
Home Education vs Control	1.46	16	.23	Not Significant, 1-tailed
Home Education and Preschool vs Control	7.46	14	1.05	Not Significant, 1-tailed
All 3 Experimental Groups vs Control	4.77	24	1.04	Not Significant, 1-tailed

*Changed selection criteria

000478

TABLE 6

Significance of Differences in Test-Retest Stanford-Binet IQ's
For B.D. 1967 Groups

Group	Tests Compared	Mean Difference	df	t	p
PRESCHOOL	Fall 1972 vs Spring 1973	7.30	9	2.47	<.05, 2-tailed
	Fall 1972 vs Spring 1974	1.12	8	.41	Not Significant, 2-tailed
	Spring 1973 vs Spring 1974	9.45	8	4.33	<.01, 2-tailed
CONTROL	Fall 1972 vs Spring 1973	.30	13	.10	Not Significant, 2-tailed
	Fall 1972 vs Spring 1974	.62	7	.18	Not Significant, 2-tailed
	Spring 1973 vs Spring 1974	2.25	7	1.03	Not Significant, 2-tailed

This gain-loss-gain pattern of the children in the experimental group poses the question, "Why did the children with the advantage of an early intervention program show this changeability while the children in the Control group did not?" One speculation is that exposure to a stimulating educational experience in the early years (pre-kindergarten) sensitizes the child (stirs up motivation) to learn. Later, enviornmental factors (teacher, material, etc.) have a greater impact on these children than on those who have not been led to have certain expectations from an educational environment. If for any reason this environment does not meet these expectations, and the child's experiences in the school environment are not challenging, the motivation level in the student tends to drop. In fact, the children in both groups were in the same kindergarten where the teacher, because of serious illness, was absent frequently and for long periods of time. The first grade teacher, on the other hand, in whose room was the majority of the Experimental and Control subjects (6 of the 9 Preschool and 5 of the 8 Controls) was consistently present and was an intensely involved, creative person who operated a relatively open classroom, with children divided into small groups much like the preschool set-up. Obviously, this is speculation but it suggests that the failure of such programs as Head Start to show maintained gains over the primary grades might not reflect on the inadequacy of the Head Start program, but on the need to fulfill the high expectations and the positive motivation for learning that has been instilled in the preschoolers.

00030

Table 4 shows, for the 1968 born children, differences between experimental and control groups on Stanford-Binet IQ's. The IQ differences at the start of kindergarten have been noted and discussed in previous reports. Only the children from the Preschool were close to being significantly higher than the Controls. (Mn Dif=16 IQ points, df=13; t=1.46, p=<.10, 1-tailed). In addition, the Preschool group was significantly higher than the Home Education group (Mn Dif=21.40 IQ points, df=12, t=2.96, p<.02, 2-tailed). The selection factors which differentiated these two experimental groups was pointed out (p. 8) in the March 1974 report. At the end of kindergarten the only significant difference between groups was the superiority of the Preschool plus Home Education group over the Home Education group (Mn Dif=12.65, df=11, t=1.99, p<.05, 1-tailed).

The low score of the Home Education children was to be expected because of the selection criteria but the only group that showed significant change at the end of the kindergarten year was the same group (Mn Dif=4.12 IQ points, df=7, t=2.42, p<.05, 2-tailed). As stated in the March 1974 report, the need for intervention was striking with this group of children. Prior to kindergarten they and their mothers were involved in a 16-week home education program. Most of their mothers continued in a home education program with younger siblings during the year these children were in kindergarten. When these children entered kindergarten they tested with the lowest mean IQ of the four reported groups, B. D. 1968. Nonetheless,

00021

over the kindergarten year they are the only group who showed a significant gain. It is postulated that the Preschool and the Preschool plus Home Education groups made their initial gains while in preschool. The Home Education group, whose parents were motivated at home, were "ripe" for this formal experience and gained by their parents continued involvement --indicating the "diffusion effect" described by Dr. Susan Gray, (See Gray, 1969) This gain was predicted in the March 1974 report when it was noted that for the four Home Education subjects who had had an IQ test when beginning Home Education and then a second IQ test at the start of kindergarten, a non-significant gain had occurred. The tendency to improve has now reached the point of statistical significance. The group as a whole has moved into the "Normal" range and out of the "Low Average" range that their Mean IQ indicated in the Fall of 1973. It is reasonable to hope this gain will continue until the point that the Home Education group is at the IQ level of their peers.

Table 5 shows the significance of differences in Stanford-Binet IQ's between the various 1969 born groups at the start of kindergarten, Fall 1974. The Preschool group was the only group significantly different from the controls. (Mn dif 6.46 IQ points higher than Control's IQ, df=16, t=4.04, $p < .005$, 1-tailed). This is the most striking contrast in the three years of testing. At the start of kindergarten, the Preschool groups have consistently been higher than the Controls (1972 $p < .10$; 1973 $p < .10$; 1974 $p < .005$) but only in the Fall 1974 has the contrast reached statistical significance and

00022

probably reflects changed selection criteria at the Preschool. In June 1973 the Guidelines of Title IV-A of the Social Security Act excluded some of the most needy children from the Center.

Table 8 shows the achievement test score means and standard deviation for 1967 and 1968-born groups. Both groups were given group-administered Tests of Basic Experience, i.e., tests in language mathematics. The tests were administered by the children's teachers in their classrooms during the spring of their kindergarten year. In the same way, the 1967-born children were administered the California Achievement Tests in reading and mathematics at the end of first grade.

Table 9 shows the mean differences among Experimental and Control groups on the achievement tests. None of the tests showed significant differences between groups. In light of differences occurring on the IQ tests, one wonders if the many uncontrolled factors involved in group administration (motivation, distractibility, etc.) mask true achievement differences. School grades from the end of first grade for the 1967-born group, from the end of kindergarten for the 1968-born group, and from the first semester for the 1969-born children are now being collected. Analyses of these grades would provide another index of achievement.

In addition to this information, data on absences and on effort and motivation as judged by teachers are being collected from school files. Community research on specific families whose children have been involved in the intervention programs and in the Control groups is also being collected.

00023

TABLE 7

Significance of Differences in Test-Retest Stanford-Binet IQ's
For B.D. 1968 Groups
Fall 1973 vs Spring 1974

Group	Mn Difference	df	t	P
Preschool	2.50	3	.77	Not Significant, 2-tailed
Home Education	4.12	7	2.42	<.05, 2-tailed
Preschool and Home Education	4.00	4	2.05	Not Significant, 2-tailed
Control	.83	5	.24	Not Significant, 2-tailed

TABLE 8

Mean Achievement Test Scores of B.D. 1967 and 1968 Groups

GROUP	Test of Basic Experience					
	Language			Mathematics		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N
B.D. 1967						
Preschool Spring 1973	18.55	Not Available	11	15.73	Not Available	11
Control 1973	18.14	"	14	17.79	"	14
B.D. 1968						
Preschool Spring 1974	17.33	2.50	3	13.33	4.03	3
Home Education Spring 1974	15.00	4.00	7	14.71	4.10	7
Preschool and Home Education Spring 1974	19.00	3.35	5	16.80	3.76	5
Control Spring 1974	17.20	2.79	5	16.00	2.00	4
All Three Experimental Groups Spring 1974	16.80	3.95	15	15.13	4.18	15

GROUP	California Achievement Test					
	Reading			Mathematics		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N
B.D. 1967						
Preschool Spring 1974	70.86	10.15	7	38.43	6.11	7
Control Spring 1974	72.25	13.80	8	48.00	12.66	8

TABLE 9

Mean Differences in Achievement Test Scores
(A) Between B.D. 1967 Preschool and Control Groups
(B) Between B.D. 1968 Experimental and Control Groups

B.D. 1967

Groups Compared	Test	Mn Difference	df	Group with Highest Mean	t*	p
Preschool vs Control	TOBE					
	Lang	0.41	23	Preschool		
	Math	2.06	23	Control		
	CAT					
	Reading	1.39	13	Control		
	Math	9.57	13	Control	1.6968	Not Significant

B.D. 1968

Groups Compared	TOBE					
Preschool vs Control	Lang	0.13	6	Preschool		
	Math	2.67	5	Control		
Preschool vs Home Education	Lang	2.33	8	Preschool		
	Math	1.38	8	Home Education		
Preschool vs Preschool and Home Education	Lang	1.67	6	Preschool		
	Math	3.47	6	Preschool & Home Ed.	1.06440	Not Significant
Home Education vs Preschool and Home Education	Lang	4.00	10	Preschool & Home Ed.	1.667	Not Significant
	Math	2.09	10	Preschool & Home Ed.	.8228	Not Significant
Home Education vs Control	Lang	2.20	10	Control	.9691	Not Significant
	Math	1.29	9	Control		
Preschool and Home Education vs Control	Lang	1.80	8	Preschool & Home Ed.		
	Math	.80	7	Preschool & Home Ed.		
All Three Experimental Groups vs Control	Lang	.40	18	Control		
	Math	.87	17	Control		

*Only t tests computed were those in which Mn Difference was large enough to leave significance in question.

One would like to answer questions like "What happened to the children who received Home Education and were of kindergarten age in Fall 1974 but did not appear in the local public school?" "What is the background of the children who did not remain in the study?" "Why do our 'intervention' children tend to stay in school in contrast to the non-intervention children?"

A data bank with this information will be maintained in confidentiality for possible follow-up and/or for a more in-depth individual look to shed light on causative factors operative in some of the statistical changes noted in this report.

Obviously not all possible analyses inherent in the data on hand have been made. Time has been a factor and comparisons related to the most pressing issues, those most directly related to the goals of this grant, have received priority. But issues like sex differences, and differences in performance as a function of number of years in preschool or Home Education are ones that hopefully will be investigated with this data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gray, Susan W., Selected Longitudinal Studies of Compensatory Education -- A Look from the Inside, Paper written for symposium at The Annual Meeting of The American Psychological Association, 1969: The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education Programs in the Early Years.

Zigler, Edward, Opening Address at Home Start Planning Conference, October 21-22, 1971.

00027

APPENDIX I

Verbatim Reactions of Parents to their Participation in the Home Education Program

Parent 01

"Since my daughter's teacher has been coming into my home, my daughter has learned to share with others, play with others. She enjoys her teacher, and they get along quite well."

Parent 02

"I am more then glad to have this opportunity to say how great this program is for my child. For the short time he have attend this school he have learn to put a puzzle together very well. He also knows the shape of square and round. He learn when too things are alike.

Since he attend this school he is very interested in bocks. He likes me to read to him. So I would like for him to continue in the school to learn. I want to say that I am with you all 100%. Thank you."

Parent 03

"I am very please to have you come in my home and work with my son Chris. Because I had tried to get him in some more Head Start. But they was fill up with kid. So I think this is a very good program for this community. My son is learning very good with his work."

Parent 04

"I learned a great deal from the Home Educator. She taught me to picture read to my child and to play number games.

Each Tuesday when she came she would bring a book and some type of numbers, shapes, alphabets or color game. Once she brought a pounding board. My daughter really liked that because she loves to make noise. I have to admit that I was really glad when that session had ended.

The home education program also helped me to better understand my child. To take time and listen to what she's saying. To talk matters out rather than scold her for what she's done.

I believe now, that since I was in the home education program I am a much better parent to my child."

00628

Parent 05

"Yes, I like the Home Educational program, because my son Anthony enjoys it very much. It lets him get acquainted with more enjoyable educational things than I had knowledge of, such as, instead of learning how to count on his fingers, he learns by counting bears and other objects. The program also gave me knowledge of things that I can buy at a store for his learning purposes other than just books. Anthony learned that each week he would get something new to learn to do. One thing that I am pleased to learn that he can match objects so well. What I would like to see added to the program is colors and alphabets, if the child is old enough to learn. We both like and benefited from everything Mrs. Johnson brought with her on each visit. Anthony enjoyed matching objects best."

Parent 06

"I think the Home Educational program is fine. The teacher that work in it are doing a good job. The children are progressing."

Parent 07

"It was an uplifting day for me. When her time to come into my house, we would talk about the children, and their young mind. I found that I was very much wrong in a lots of things. She made me understand little things, how to be patience, and listen, to them more and I enjoy talking to her. She came with a smile. We play games, read book together. I really enjoyed, and learn a lots."

Parent 08

"I thought Home Education was a great experience for my child, as well as for myself. It made me more aware of her needs, and gave me great ideas on how to go about helping her. It gave me a basic idea of what was going on in the Center. I was very pleased with Home Education. I think it helped in many ways."

Parent 09

"I would like to thank HICA, Mrs. Morris and all that is concerned with the Home Educational Program. I think this is a great program. It has helped my granddaughter in so many ways. It has taught her to play and share with others. It has taught her to read with pictures. And she's learning to count. I hoped that this program has helped others as much as it has helped Latrice. It has prepared her for pre-school.

APPENDIX I I

THE MUNDELEIN-HICA HOME-BASED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

Margaret I. Healy
Mundelein College

It is the history of most early intervention programs for very young children to begin with a focus on the child in a child center. However, most psychologists and educators concerned about the gaps that exist between the educational "haves" and educational "have-nots" and who have attempted to close this gap by providing early intervention programs soon concluded that parental involvement was essential if gains were to be sustained. They began to seek parent-involvement through meetings, setting up parent-education centers in the child center, and including parents on child center staff and child center advisory boards, but most of the "intervenors" finally concluded that none of these programs provided adequate parent involvement for many children. The Mundelein College experience was no exception.

In a West Side area of Chicago known as Lawndale and within a small geographic area where a community was incorporated under the name of HICA, Mundelein College developed a Child Center. The Child Center, known as the HICA Child Center, was established in 1969-70 and neighborhood parents were trained to staff it. After regular educational meetings for parents were planned and implemented and after a parent association

00030

was developed, the directors concluded that the program for parents was inadequate. Many parents were not being reached. Accordingly, the administrative staff spent a year in reviewing parent programs across the nation. The Home Education Program developed as part of the DARCEE Program under Dr. Susan Gray at George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tennessee, seemed to be the model most appropriate for the Mundelein Early Childhood Program and was introduced with some modifications in the HICA area in the summer of 1971. It was funded by means of a research grant from the National Insitute of Mental Health with a project period limited to three years.

The Mundelein-HICA Home Education Program was unique, we believe, in several ways. First, it assumed that parents had certain kinds of expertise in rearing children in their own culture and in their own neighborshoods and should be encouraged to share it. Secondly, Home Educators were parents from the neighborhood served. Thirdly, in addition to parents who requested participation in home education and parents whose children were in the child center and whose names were suggested to Home Education staff because of specific needs, the Home Educators recruited parents for the program from the neighborhood using their own experience as a reason for other parents becoming involved in the program. This aspect of the program, recruitment by peers, was in fact essential because the effort in the program was to reach the most disadvantaged of the disadvantaged and therefore, it was expected in the beginning stages that resistance from some families would

00031

be felt. By encouragement from persons they felt they could trust and by patient and skillful explaining of the program, it was hoped that resistance would be broken down so that families of the children who were ordinarily excluded from intervention programs because of parental resistance would be and could be included in the Home Education Program in HICA. There was no coercion and there was no "buying" of parents; no fee was paid or reduction of fees given if parents participated in the program. The sole reward promised was the regular communication with the Home Educator and the increased self-confidence that would come to the parents as they observed with pride the progress of the child. Direct contacts with the home were ordinarily made by the Home Educators; professionals visited homes only upon the request of the Home Educators and the parents.

There was another type of uniqueness in the program in that it was neighborhood-based and all participants resided in an eight-block area. While at one time the population was highly concentrated, since the Mundelein-HICA education programs were initiated in 1967 many buildings have been torn down, so that a population of 7500 is probably half that large today. There is, as in most black, segregated, metropolitan areas, a high concentration of welfare families; yet, there does exist also a few black families with middle-class values. Some families have fathers regularly employed and mothers who seek employment after the children are old enough to be in school. Some of the families are home owners and they form, probably, the leadership in

HICA, attempting to bring the people together to improve their environment and to upgrade the quality of living within the community. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the residents receive public aid. About 97% of the adults have not finished high school and, of these, a very high percentage have not finished eighth grade. Hundreds of the families are headed by women, many of whom are migrants from the South.

The first year of the program, 1971-72, was spent chiefly in preparing staff to do this new work. Staff members from the Child Center, particularly those who had once been home visitors, were selected and trained by the Director of the Child Center. They were given an understanding of the principles of child development. They were also given an understanding and an awareness of curriculum materials that are used with young children. All of the Home Educators had some experience, from six weeks to two years or more, in working under the Director in the Child Center with children ages 2 to 5. Two had been prepared by a social worker for procedures in home visiting.

It was necessary for the staff to begin immediately the recruiting of families that indicated special need and who could gain by participating in the Home Education Program. Some of these were recommended by the Child Center Director but most of the families were unknown to the staff and recruiting was difficult. The concept was new and resistance was general because most of these families were welfare families whose experience with

00033

case workers had made them suspicious of anyone coming to the home. Moreover, during the beginning stages the Home Educators were too inexperienced to communicate a high level of confidence.

While it could have been more rewarding to work with highly motivated families who wanted the very best of education and opportunity for their children, the focus of the HICA Home Education Program was the family who most needed home education, the child who most needed to have a parent understand the principles of child development and the role that the parent has in stimulating positive cognitive, physical, emotional and social growth. These are the families that rarely volunteer to participate in Head Start or other early intervention programs.

By the second year of the program, 1972-73, the staff was well trained, able and confident, and had completed college courses in child development and in early childhood curriculum and had been self-educated as well as team-educated in techniques for reaching families. The program itself was becoming stabilized. The decision had been made to break the yearly sessions into three fifteen-week terms and a short summer term. A term involved a one-hour session per week with parent and child, or parent-substitute and child, or child/parent and other siblings who wanted to participate or at least observe. Parents were encouraged to continue into a second or even a third term and many did. Some parents who were involved in the 1971-72

00031

year asked to continue in the Home Education Program in the 1972-73, 1973-74 years... so that some parents participated in one session, some two, some three and some even four. At least 53 families participated in a minimum of two Home Education sessions, which would be approximately thirty clock hours. During each term there was a planned trip for the families and there was an effort every term for the Home Educators to bring their mothers and children to a social hour at the Home Education Center. The intent of the group activities was both to bring the parents together and also to provide the opportunity for the children and their parents to get out of the ghetto and to see more of the city of Chicago and the opportunities that parents have for extending the experience of their children.

The educational program was theoretically eclectic and planned to provide for the physical, social, emotional and intellectual development of the child within its total milieu. Therefore, efforts were made to involve the home, community and school in working toward improving the quality of living and learning in the neighborhood. In the words of Dr. Susan Gray, "If the school, community, and home cannot work together to sustain that early gain of the early intervention recipient, it is no wonder children continue to fall behind as they move through their school system."

The Home Education experience in HICA confirms the conclusion drawn from similar projects that the child progresses in direct relationship to the extent of participation by parent and child in the home-based program.

09635

And our experience also reinforces Dr. Gray's very strong conclusion to her paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, 1969: "The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education Programs in the Early Years."

> ". . . And so we come to the end of this presentation, needing a conclusion. About the only conclusion we can make is that intervention programs can make a difference when carefully defined, implemented, and assessed. It is a long, difficult road, however. Anyone is going to be rudely disillusioned who thinks that there is one simple way -- a button to press, or a lever to pull. Massive deprivation demands massive measures. And it demands these over time. The environment which created a deficit will continue to take its toll after intervention ceases, unless the environment is improved. For the next few decades early intervention probably is the necessary condition for improving the educability of disadvantaged children, but it is certainly not a sufficient condition. If the school, community, and home cannot work to sustain that early gain, it is no wonder children continue to fall behind as they move through their school years. We need better intervention programs, with improved techniques, and more appropriate targets, and ones with a more massive input. While some must work to improve the national scene in the immediate future, others must work to develop and test more effective programs, which over time can be put to wider use."

Gray, Susan W., Selected Longitudinal Studies of Compensatory Education --A Look from the Inside, Paper written for symposium at The Annual Meeting of The American Psychological Association, 1969: The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education Programs in the Early Years.

00036